

УДК 130.2

Henrich Rickert's Methodology and its Application for Solution of the Problem of Cultural Values in Contemporary Theory of Culture

Natalia P. Koptzeva* and Anna A. Makhonina

Siberian Federal University,
79 Svobodny, Krasnoyarsk, 660041 Russia¹

Received 23.03.2009, received in revised form 30.03.2009, accepted 6.04.2009

The article is devoted to consideration of the problem of cultural values in contemporary theory of culture.

While searching for the ways of solution of the problem of definition of «cultural value» concept and its importance for the sphere of the humanities, the authors apply philosophical and methodological systems of H. Rickert and those ones of many Russian researches such as Ilyin V.V., Plotnikov V.I., Pivovarov D.V., and others.

Comprehension of cultural value as some special kind of ideal is suggested to be a base of scientific classification and methodology of explorations of nature of cultural values in contemporary theory of culture and humanitarian knowledge as a whole.

Keywords: culture sciences, methodology of culture studying, H. Rickert's theory, cultural values, ideal.

Point of View

The contemporary crisis state of the humanities is stipulated by the problem of their position at culture and by the methodological problem of humanitarian knowledge consisting of the necessity of search for methodological unity. The necessity of elaboration of methodology of the humanities was particularly keenly predetermined by Positivism of the first half of the 19th century, which refused the humanities to have a special scientific status and set methodology of natural sciences as a basic scientific and methodological system. But there are some philosophical researches quite thoroughly showing belonging of humanitarian knowledge to science and

scantiness of application of natural scientific approach to methodology of the humanities. This point of view is represented by the philosophical theory of Neo-Kantianism Baden School's founder Henrich Rickert (1836-1936).

The main aim of Rickert's philosophical investigation is stated by the philosopher as consideration of specificity of methodology of the humanities presupposing comprehension of object's individuality and peculiarity in contrast to methodology of natural sciences aimed at generalization and revealing of some general principles and laws. Following W. Windelband, Rickert denies the classification of science into «sciences of nature» and «sciences of spirit»

* Corresponding author E-mail address: decanka@mail.ru

¹ © Siberian Federal University. All rights reserved

thinking of the definition «sciences of spirit» as a rather inexact one. But some formal principle is taken instead according to which some sciences deal with search for new laws and their formulation and others are sciences of events and explore separate facts as something unique, which doesn't have any analogues and which can't be reduced to a law.

Like W. Windelband, who had distinguished two basic scientific methods – «nomothetic» (based on general laws), explaining general and repeated things, and «idiographic», describing peculiar features, Rickert suggests «generalizing» and «individualizing» methods. According to Rickert, the sphere of scientific cognition is formed with two fields – natural science and history. Natural sciences explore an object with generalizing method and the field of the humanities is explored with individualizing methods of history.

Rickert thoroughly considers specificities of this methodological model in his works «The limits of natural scientific formation of concepts» (1896), «Sciences of nature and sciences of culture» (1911).

Having worked out methodology of historical sciences of culture, philosopher finds out a following contradiction: there is a conventional opinion that a single and individual thing is not an object of science, for science is not aimed at exploration of facts from the point of view of individuality and peculiarity. But Rickert gives a convincing refutation of this, taking notice of «reality» concept. The point is that reality is always much wider and deeper than any concepts, which are abstract from reality and convey just only some few aspects of reality in schematization and generalization. Rickert notices that «empirical reality represents immense variety increasing for us as far as we deepen in it and start to divide it into component elements, for even «the smallest» part of it contains more than

a finite man is able to describe, to comprehend in his concepts and, thus, in his cognition and infinitely scanty in comparison with what he has to leave aside» [17, p. 61]. According to Rickert, generalization means «escape from reality» [17, p. 68], for there is no any notion able to cover reality, which always lies not only in individuality and peculiarity. Generalization and explication of reality into concepts considerably make scanty the content of reality, which demands not systemized generalization and dead schematization, but comprehension of individual, peculiar and essential features of a phenomenon or an event, and the humanities are the closest science to such comprehension. There is always simplification of reality and its becoming finite and loss of its wholeness in immanative comprehension of reality and transformation of an event. As a result, a concept of generalizing nature discovers its impotence at the effort of precise scientific representation of reality.

Every concept of every science conveys only few object's aspects or qualities abstracted and selected from its real content according to that point of view some science is guided by. Depending on the method a searcher uses, reality takes an appropriate form: reality considered with generalizing method becomes nature, and if it is considered with individualizing method, it becomes history.

If establishment of general principles of everything existing is characteristic of natural science, then, according to Rickert's point of view, representation of single and unique events once happened is important for history. The essence of an individual or an event in its singleness, unique and peculiar nature is explored with individualizing method defined by Rickert as «every synthesis of essential elements of some reality» [17, p. 89]. Historical science in Rickert's philosophy is knowledge of past as knowledge of unique facts, personalities, and phenomena,

but not their general principles. Thus, there was raised the problem of individualizing method and elaboration of individualizing concepts within the frames of Neo-Kantianism, in particular, in Rickert's philosophical conception.

According to Rickert, there is a special contraposition between sciences dealing with concept and sciences connected with exploration of reality, which «lies in peculiar and individual features» and which «can't be constructed from general elements by no means» [17, p. 73]. Rickert writes: «... In order to achieve two purely logical concepts of science and nature, which doesn't mean two different realities, but the only one considered from two different points of view, I have tried to formulate the main logical problem of classification of sciences according to their methods, and, in this very sense, I contrapose individualizing method of history to generalizing method of natural science» [17, p. 75]. Rickert gives an explanation of the essence of natural science which is to embrace many different processes in its notions while «historical science tries to adapt its exposition to one object different from the others» [17, p.78].

Rickert's methodology is based on the argument that natural science is not the only possibility of cognition of reality, for the main methodological instrument of natural science is abstraction and its object is general things which appear only as a result of logical abstraction. Reality is out of abstraction and much wider in contrast to deadening schematization and systematization. But Rickert doesn't deny the importance of generalizing method at cognition of reality defining its role as auxiliary for the humanities and historical sciences. Rickert remarks conditional character of application of these two methods and supposes that «natural scientific concepts formed with scientific generalizing method will be of more importance and they will be used more successfully at

historical science in future than now» [17, p. 83]. The problem of historical sciences of culture is not only individual peculiarity of a single event or some concrete single historical whole, but the question is of the peculiarity uniting a whole group of objects. Thus, Rickert affirms that «there is no any science of culture which couldn't operate with many grouped concepts» [17, p. 106].

Rickert finds that the identity of approach of natural scientific knowledge and that one of the humanities is impossible because of the essential difference of formation of concepts of natural science and history. Thus, the philosopher remarks: «As far as the culture value of an object is taken into consideration as a whole, it is not based on the features common with the other realities, but it is based on its difference with them. Therefore the reality we consider from the point of view of its relation to cultural values is to be also considered from the point of view of peculiarity and individuality. Often, the more cultural significance of some phenomenon, the more appropriate cultural value is connected with its individual aspect» [17, p. 89]. At the same time, single, individual and peculiar qualities don't mean something isolated in Rickert's theory: the object of history and culture makes a single indissoluble whole with historical context. In this connection, historical whole is not something general, but it has individual and peculiar nature in its singleness.

Rickert is guided by «reality» concept at elaboration of individualizing method of history. While plunging in the concept, he proceeds from the idea of value. As Rickert points out, if there was found a very precise definition of the object of natural sciences – that is nature describing the specific character of natural sciences, then the concept of value is for the humanities. Value is a determinative concept of culture, which is to be culture as far as it receives and preserves some appropriate values for the sake of them.

The «value» concept is determinative for the distinction between the humanities and natural sciences. The appearance of value in the sphere of culture and humanitarian knowledge can be explained by the fact that, in contrast to a naturalist, who is guided by many axioms, theorems, and already existing schemes of knowledge from the very beginning, a researcher of the sphere of the humanities in his work with reality faces the choice of the most important and essential thing for a concrete event and process at the very concrete moment. The value related to an object is objective while it turns into a subjective valuation in its interaction with a subject. Using the base of Kant's philosophy, Rickert shows that just subjectivity of the point of view of a searcher of historical sciences of culture is a methodological support of the objectivity of scientific formation of notions. But at the same time, there is a necessity of objective critical approach in the substantiation of subjective selection of methods of cognition in the attitude to a concrete historical and cultural object. The requirement of that selection is a compulsory premise of value and significance. Rickert maintains that culture and humanitarian knowledge deal with generally important values obtaining not facts, but significance, while everything rising out of value belongs to nature and to the sphere of natural scientific research. Thus, the philosopher works out individualizing method on the base of axiology, and the concept of value is determinative of Rickert's philosophy of culture and philosophy of history. Rickert's axiology has transcendent nature, and it is expressed in the philosopher's doctrine of independent realm of values, which corresponds to neither the sphere of objects nor the sphere of subjects and is determined as «sense above any being». Only value allows to divide all the processes taking place in reality into «essential» and «non-essential», and that determinates all the things that happens in reality as historically

important individuals or diversified being within the frames of historical sciences of culture [17, p. 90]. Rickert's principle of value is a cardinal criterion of distinction between cultural processes and phenomena of nature at scientific cognition. In this connection, historical and individualizing method is defined by Rickert as a method of correspondence to value in contrast to natural science, within the frames of method of which appropriate connections are established ignoring cultural values and correspondence of object of natural sciences to them [17, p. 93].

Values are not reality, but they are its significance, not its facts, and they determine a subject's actions in his selection of appropriate events and facts for a concrete context. Axiological method allows to construct a hierarchy of values, in which Rickert distinguishes 6 spheres:

- scientific cognition;
- art;
- pantheism;
- ethics;
- the good;
- theism, belief in personal god (truth, the beautiful, super-personal holiness, morals, happiness, and personal holiness).

The contrast of generalizing and individualizing methods of historical and natural sciences and estimative and non-estimative ways of thinking based on Kant's doctrine of antinomies allowed Rickert to make a classification of the existing sciences consisting of 4 classes:

- 1) generalizing and non-estimative sciences (classical natural sciences);
- 2) individualizing and non-estimative sciences (evolutional biology, geology);
- 3) generalizing and estimative sciences (economics, sociology called by Rickert natural scientific interpretation of social and spiritual human life);
- 4) individualizing and estimative sciences (history).

In this classification, Rickert gives the preference to history as science most adequately exploring the processes of reality, for the object of history is a single and separate event. Though Rickert's antithesis «reality – values» gives birth to the ethical antithesis «existent – due», and philosophy becomes science when it explores the world of values.

According to Rickert, reality is represented as something permanent and various. The foundation of value can be seen in the fact that cognition, in particular scientific cognition of reality, inevitably makes «cuts» in its way, some intermittence of continuous reality, some special transformation of «various continuity into intermittence» [17, p. 64]: there is to be a premise or some a priori in method allowing a researcher to distinguish an essential thing from an inessential one. According to Rickert, carrying out of operation of distinguishing of an essential thing from an inessential one brings forth the formal principle, which allows to make clear the notion of scientific form. The formal principle allows to make out a formal content of reality and that thing, which called the essence of things (Wesen) [17, p. 64]. Rickert sees the process of transformation of heterogeneous air into intermittence in the process of formation of a scientific notion; a notion as though puts the limits over one or another fragment of reality [17, P. 62-63]. According to Rickert, the first science making that intermittence is mathematics.

Generalizing method doesn't assume correlation between an object and value, for nature doesn't deal with valuations, but with facts. According to Rickert, the objects of the humanities can't be considered with generalizing method because it destroys the unity and vital wholeness of an object and makes cognition of individuality and unique features impossible and, as a consequence, comprehension of true essence of an object of humanitarian knowledge. Rickert

substantiates the impossibility of synthesis of the two methods with the fact that spiritual life as an object of the humanities in contrast to nature determined by the causation can't be brought to appropriateness to any laws, for the very notion of appropriateness to law contradicts to the notion of freedom, and spiritual life looses freedom as its main essence within the frames of appropriateness to law. Rickert draws a conclusion that there is to be a method quite contrary to generalizing method of natural sciences, «the base and value of which is consideration of an object as a whole» [17, p. 73]. If generalizing method brings natural scientific knowledge to system, individualizing method of history diverges from systematization based on generalization and it is not founded on conformity to natural laws and repetitions. Rickert's conception is criticized by positivism from that point of view, but Rickert substantiates the point of view that the essence and significance of one or other cultural and historical processes are founded on their difference, peculiarity and individuality. History explores singleness, the things that happened one day but that would be never repeated again. Then the problem of comprehension and uniqueness of cultural and historical whole in the past and present becomes the cardinal scientific aim of a historian and a student of culture.

In his characterization of the main difference between natural sciences and history, Rickert remarks that an object and method of natural sciences are indispensable – that is «nature», being and existence free from correlation to value. Accordingly, the aim of natural sciences is to study general and abstract relations and laws spreading on those being and existence. The only particular thing at natural science can be «specimen», one from a great number of objects of this or that kind or class, and there is no any of those objects avoiding the influence of natural scientific method. Correspondently, Rickert

defines nature as totality of reality comprehended from the point of view of generalizing method and out of relation to values [17, P. 100-101].

On the other hand, Rickert notes the necessity of search after an appropriate concept and method of historical sciences of culture, an analogue of the precise concept «nature» at natural science. «Culture» can be such a term. According to Rickert, the cardinal aim of individualizing methodology is elaboration of the one and objective concept of culture, which would stipulate for the unity and objectivity of sciences of culture as well as the unity, objectivity and significance of the established values [17, p. 125]. The philosopher argues for the direct dependence of development of objectivity's index of sciences of culture on «the progress at working out of objective and systematically sectioned notion of culture» as a measure of approaching to the system of significant values. Rickert tells of two basic concepts of individualizing method: those are «cultural values» at sciences of culture and «individuality» meaning every single and particular reality and presupposing consideration of a single development in its particularity and uniqueness. Rickert puts a notion «historical individual» in force for a historically individual event, person and phenomenon. Since historical individuals have their aims, historical formation of concepts has teleological nature within the frames of Rickert's individualizing method of history. Cultural value methodologically determines the formation of notions of historical sciences, for «only the things having significance for the dominant cultural value in their individual peculiarity are essential for them» [17, P. 100-101]. The significance of cultural processes is based on their peculiarity and distinctive specificity, and the idea of individual's cultural personal unity, individual whole is represented as one of the trends of Rickert's methodology [17, p. 103]. Research of individual essence and meaning

of an event, person, and process on the base of axiological and subjective approach and with the help of individualizing method demands a single and individual character of relation of a researcher to a historical and cultural object. Thus, Rickert exploring the concepts of singleness, particularity and individuality appealed to the theory of Hegel and Neo-Hegelianism.

The problem of being of cultural values is one of the most actual theoretical problems at culture studies, which can be successfully solved by appliance of Rickert's methodology.

Example

The problem of cultural values is very complicated for research. From the one hand, it is stipulated by the fact that the actual and living state of culture and its current processuality «Here» and «Now» are to be explored. The notion of cultural values in the research literature is very often determined by turning to more universal categories, which are to be precised in the context of specificity of cultural values. The definition of cultural values from the point of view of a work of art is characteristic of the contemporary science. As a rule, these definitions are based on UNESCO «Convention on the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict» edited in 1954, where values are understood as monuments of architecture, art or history, religious, secular, and archeological dispositions, architectural ensemble of historical or artistic interest, works of art, manuscripts, books, and other objects of artistic, historical and archeological importance as well as scientific collections or important collections of books, archival materials or reproductions of the things mentioned above. Besides, Convention includes the buildings in the structure of cultural values, the main and real purpose of which is conservation and exhibition of movable values: museums, big libraries, archival depositories, etc.

In this context, cultural values are defined as «property values of religious or secular nature, which are of historical, artistic, scientific or some other cultural importance: pieces of art, books, manuscripts, incunabula, archives, components and fragments of architectural, historical, and artistic monuments, and also monuments of monumental art and other categories of objects» [4]. It is easy to notice that such comprehension of cultural values can be applied to every artifact of culture, but nothing clearing up in its essence of cultural values, therefore it is not philosophical in the strict sense of the word.

The contemporary researchers emphasize that the very definition of the term «cultural value» becomes a great problem. Thus, the term «value» is quite wide-spread in philosophical and sociological literature, and it indicates individual, social and cultural significance of some certain phenomena of reality.

The most wide-spread definition of value interprets it as «a special social relation owing to which the necessities and interests of an individual or a social group are transferred to the world of things, objects, spiritual phenomena giving them some certain social qualities, which are not directly connected with their utilitarian purpose» [19]. The whole variety of objects of human activity, public relations and phenomena of nature included in their circle can be «objective values» as the objects of valuable relations. The methods and criteria as the base of estimation of appropriate phenomena are fixed in social consciousness and culture as «subjective values». Thus, «objective» and «subjective» values serve as some kind of two poles of valuable attitude of a man to the world.

Nevertheless, the very notion of value is applied in various meaning in philosophical and culture studying literature, which brings to the quite contradictory ideas of culture. While there is significance of value of culture, the role of

values in structure and function of culture makes nobody doubt. Literature as a social phenomenon is very often distinguished only by valuable orientations.

There has been formed a number of specific approaches to definition of «value» concept:

1) value is identified with a new idea represented as an individual and social orientation;

2) value is comprehended as a wide spread subjective image or idea of human dimension;

3) value is synonymous with cultural and historical standards;

4) value associates with the type of «dignified» manner and with a concrete life style.

Ilyin V.V. in «Axiology» [6, p. 16] writes that values include variety of trajectories of subjective systems (phase points) determined by intentions (original conditions).

The author considers the values of cognition, politics, civilization, existence, PR, church, education, social activity in the chapter «The World of Values».

In his research work «The Russian cultural values abroad» [7], Kovalevskyi P.E. determines cultural values as the Great Russian culture in all its displays – literature, art, science, religious creative activity, and the whole totality of the great nation's life.

In the course «The Golden Age of the Russian Philosophy: the Problems of Human Being» [11], Nekrasova E.N. concentrates upon the problems of spiritual culture and those moral, aesthetic and religious values, which formed and still form the possibilities of realization of a human being as personality, help him with orientation in difficult social conditions, discover his sense of existence, etc.

O.Y. Markova's article «Education in the system of values of culture of contemporary man» [10] sets forth the problem of education in

educational theory and practice, which consists of the constantly reproducing contradiction between the object of knowledge stored by the humankind and individual personal abilities and necessities for their adoption and use.

Bolshakov V.P. writes in his work «The problems of studying of valuable aspects of life in Russia» [2] that the further destiny of Russia and the whole world depends on what is happening with culture and inside culture. The reappraisal of values has entailed changes both in civilization and culture. The author argues about the fact that culture doesn't suffer the global crisis, nothing cardinal has happened. The greater part of population doesn't know how to use even limited freedom. And at the same time, «spiritual development of the new generation takes its course in the situation of absence and domination of any valuable orientations, but with semi-cultural and anti-cultural influences alien to the Russian tradition».

Having taken place in all the spheres of social life, the changes influenced on the forms of socialization of a man, changed social preferences and values. These changes are connected with penetration of the «western» valuable orientation, but conservation of values and ideals characteristic of the Russian society also takes place. The problem of loss of values and conflict of generations is very important today, for values as actual senses considerably influence on an individual life and they are of importance in function of society. The author's conclusions consist of the point that such values of culture as the Good, Beauty, Truth, Freedom, Love, Faith, etc. are eternal. Values of culture do not become past, but only some forms of their realization may change, and that will help both society and a concrete man to achieve a high level of culture, to be cultural, but not seem to be.

A number of researches dealt with study of values of culture: Boguslavskiy M.M. «The

destiny of cultural values» [1]; Tonenkov M.M. «The spiritual wings of Russia» [20] (social and cultural and spiritual essential values); Krivtun O.A. «The values of culture and destiny of art» [8]; Lossky N.O. «The values and being» [9]. Besides, thesis of Pustovalova E.V. «The system being of values of individual subject» (Barnaul, 2005) [15] and thesis of Hudyakova N.L. «Ontological base of appearance and development of the valuable world of man» [5] are devoted to the problem of cultural values.

The various aspects, which can be used for analysis of one or another artistic phenomenon, are revealed in many researches of the concept «value». But the thorough philosophical investigation of the problem of values carried out by Russian philosopher Plotnikov V.I. is of the most methodological importance, for the philosopher constructs a synthetic theory of value, which can be a theoretical and methodological source for exploration of cultural values and their mechanisms.

Plotnikov V.I. defines value as «formed in conditions of civilization and directly experienced form of people's attitude towards those universal specimens of culture and extreme possibilities, on realization of which every individual's ability to project future, estimate «other» and keep past in memory depends» [3, p. 1001]. The valuable attitude of a man towards the world as a principally new universal form of projection of human behavior both on social and individual levels appears inside civilization for the first time. Plotnikov V.I. remarks that «the new form of projection of people's real life and their aspirations for future with regard for generic experience and personal destinies of individuals was in need of balanced mechanism of concordance of individual initiative and social conditions of their realization, the perspective common to all mankind and personal form of its assimilation, social and cultural specimens and

orientation of generations replacing each other in time to those specimens. Such a difficult form of universal projection spontaneously appearing is value» [ibidem, p. 1003].

The philosopher distinguishes the system of valuable relation of many levels pointing at personal and mass levels of function of values. The following structure of valuable relation is characteristic of personal level: 1) primary layer of desire, expectations, and preferences formed on initial stage of person's ontogenesis and forming initial level of public conscience; 2) vital (not game and imaginative) choice of an individual between orientations to the nearest aims (with their directly obvious profit) and orientation to the remote life perspective (with its psychologically attractive value); 3) individual's consciousness of the fact that the life choice is not an act of a moment, but a continual life state; 4) transformation of choice of values into the base of estimation of every «other», i.e. orientations chosen by other people [ibidem, P. 1003-1004].

As Plotnikov V.I. writes, the integral structure of valuable relation «is an evidence of its being as **projective reality**, i.e. the reality formed on the foundation of signs directly merging individual and mass consciences, subjective and objective realities together, and it turns out to be brought neither to cognitive activity nor to practice» [ibidem, p. 1004].

The following statement is very important for this thesis research: values don't only appear in the process of life choice of value, but **they become objective reality as a practically significant specimen**. After the life choice is determined, value gets its **ideal form** subjectively existing as an inner base and regulator able to compare positive and negative (estimation), qualitative and quantitative (worth), practically achievable and doubtful (benefit), supreme and inferior (the Good). Plotnikov V.I. writes that value is such a

field of possibilities realized in public activities or returned to the sphere of ideal interrelation of people in the universal **social and cultural sphere of life** [ibidem, p. 1004].

The idea of value worked out by V.I. Plotnikov as a form of people's attitude towards the **universal specimens of culture** becomes the base of our assumption that contents of the concepts «ideal» and «cultural value» are extremely close to each other and have their own specificities at the same time.

V.I. Plotnikov emphasizes the projective nature of value; he supposes that valuable attitude exists as a projecting reality «formed on the base of signs and directly connecting subjecting and objective realities; and it turns out to be brought neither to cognitive activity nor to practice». The philosopher accentuates that there are no any values for an individual out of his life choice.

By correlation between this interpretation and **definition of ideal** (as a result of dialectic relation of subject and object, and there appears something «concrete-and-general» (D.V. Pivovarov's term) as a result of that relation, a model combining material appearance and spiritual senses (knowledge of this model is extrapolated to supersensible reality)), we are able to represent a definition of cultural values as a methodological base of music art studies in this research context.

Cultural value is a special kind of ideal formed in civilization and a form of people's attitude towards the universal models of culture directly experienced by people, which has a nature of projecting reality and exists in the situation of life choice of one or other practically significant models.

There can be distinguished such cultural values among their diversity as those ones which maximally supply with optimal conformity between stability of social existence, a large variety of culture and free individual development.

Masterpieces of art are the carriers of cultural values.

The importance of masterpieces of art as ontological carriers of cultural values can be deduced from the conception of culture as ideal formation. It is necessary to answer the question of philosophical comprehension of the content of ideal by consideration of the content of culture as ideal formation, i.e. creation and translation of models (examples) of human activity at individual, social and cosmic levels. The content of ideal in general is a unity and wholeness of a person (with himself, a concrete social group, the whole society, and cosmos).

The notion of wholeness is connected with acknowledgement of this quality of every object, phenomenon, event, process, and action, which reveals a concrete definiteness of that object in itself, phenomenon, event, process, and action, and it is not to be brought to a sum (system) of separate elements. That whole, which is always much more than a sum of its parts, is a mere simple concreteness at the same time. For instance, a family has to be a whole, but not a group of people connected with each other by the place of residence, ties of relationship, etc. A family will have a function of juridical and legal notion without that wholeness, but it will not be a social and cultural reality. And at the same time, wholeness is modeled by many ways, one of them has been fixed in postmodernism model.

The realization of the sought wholeness is certainly to be accompanied by comprehension of the content and method, which help it to be achieved. Theoretical and cultural analysis of the contemporary conceptions of culture provides with possibility to look at ideal as a complex cultural phenomenon, find its place in the ideological system of a concrete type of culture. Social ideal is a complex phenomenon where the wholeness of social life finds its completeness. Ideal is a special way of reproduction of integral

characteristics of objective reality in the forms of social consciousness, a way characteristic of interrelation of subject and object. Ideal as a universal form of purposeful activity is an integrated base of different social and cultural types of society.

D.V. Pivovarov points out that the process of ideal formation is revealed in the subjective and objective conception of ideal. It is defined as «mutual reflection of object and subject» with its indispensable components: 1) an object distinguished in some sensibly perceptible objective air, which is acknowledged as a relatively complete, exemplary, and representative subject; 2) position of that model («sign of concealed essence») in individual's subjective world with interiorization of a devised scheme of actions with a pattern; 3) extrapolation of empirical knowledge of model's concrete characteristics in a much wider reality very often inaccessible to direct experience and then super sensible reality. As D.V. Pivovarov remarks, the choice and acknowledgement of a model as well as its invention can be stipulated mainly either by individual factor or social forces [14].

Ideal formation as creation of cultural values can be considered as an invariant of modeling of social wholeness in the actual field of culture. Concerning this, the definition of artistic culture I.A. Panteleeva suggests is worth to be considered: artistic culture is a «sphere inside the space of culture where specific ideals are produced, distributed and consumed» [12, p. 13]. Though the researcher states that just the sphere of fine arts appears to be the most representative ideal, there is a conclusion that «the cardinal section of the system of representations of artistic culture are pieces of art, in the specificity of which single and general are revealed» [12, p. 14]. Some chosen pieces of art among a great number of works of art – «masterpieces» or «exemplary ideals» of artistic culture – are revealed («visible», «audible»,

etc.) ideals representing the ontological spheres most important for some culture – nature, society, a man, God [ibidem].

Thus, from the point of view of identification of content of the concepts «ideal» and «cultural values», culture forms ideal and idealized values and works out ideals carrying the function of stimuli and purpose for formation and selection of aims in human life. Culture has a function of purpose formation; it makes aims typified, works out their content and makes them be achievement of society.

Conclusion

1. Rickert's individualizing method is to reveal the essence of historical and cultural whole in displaying of its basic distinctions from other historical and cultural objects. Research of peculiarity of different cultures in the world today allows to explore the specificities of their dialogic interrelation. Thus, Rickert's individualizing

method applied to historical sciences of culture is able to solve the problem of formalization and prognostication both particular and global and historical processes of the world today by exploration of essence of a phenomenon in its individual and unique nature.

2. Appliance of Henrich Rickert's methodology allows to distinguish the very problematic area of culture studies and consider the concept of cultural values as an independent notion of culture studies with its own content and methodical set of instruments.

3. There can be constructed the following definition of cultural values by application of H. Rickert's methodology. Cultural value is a special kind of ideal formed in civilization and a form of people's attitude towards the universal models of culture directly experienced by people, which has a nature of projecting reality and exists in the situation of life choice of one or other practically significant models.

References

1. Boguslavskiy, M.M. Destiny of cultural values. Moscow, 2006. – 208 p.
2. Bolshakov, V.P. Values of culture and time (some problems of contemporary theory of culture). Great Novgorod, 2002.
3. Contemporary philosophical dictionary. Ed. prof. V.E. Kemerov. London, Frankfurt am Main, Paris, Luxembourg, Moscow, Minsk, 1998. – 1064 p.
4. Glossary.: http://www.glossary.ru/cgi-bin/gl_sch2.cgi?RKzr;yzwt:!!l.ttxyo
5. Hudyakova, N.L. Ontological base of appearance and development of the human world of values: abstract of thesis. Omsk, 2004. – 40 p.
6. Ilyin, V.V. Axiology. Moscow, 2005. – 213 p.
7. Kovalevskiy, P.E. Russian cultural traditions abroad. San Francisco, 1966. – P. 78-83.
8. Krivtun, O.A. Aesthetics. Moscow, 1998. – 429 p.
9. Losskiy, N.O. Value and being. Moscow, 2000. – 864 p.
10. Markova, O.Y. Education in the system of values of culture of a man today. St. Petersburg, 2004. – Vol. 2. – P. 177-187.
11. Nekrasova, E.N. The golden age of Russian philosophy: the problems of human being: course. <http://www.homo.fizteh.ru/programs/culture/nekrasova.htm>
12. Panteleeva, I.A. Representative quality of works of fine arts in artistic culture: abstract of thesis. Krasnoyarsk, 2004. – 21 p.
13. Philosophical encyclopedic dictionary. Moscow, 1989. – 815 p.

14. Pivovarov, D.V. Culture as ideal formation // Culture and artistic culture: a book of collected articles. Krasnoyarsk, 2000. – 235 p.
15. Pustovalova, E.V. System being of values of an individual subject: abstract of thesis. Barnaul, 2005. – 21 p.
16. Rickert, H. Philosophy of life. Moscow, 1998. – 512 p.
17. Rickert, H. Sciences of nature and culture. Moscow, 1998. – P. 44-128.
18. Rickert, H. The limits of natural scientific formation of notion: logical introduction in historical sciences. Moscow, 1997. – 534 p.
19. Slozhenkina, N.S. Philosophical analysis of truth at fine arts: abstract of thesis. Magnitogorsk, 2006. – 23 p.
20. Tonenkova, M.M. Spiritual wings of Russia – social and cultural and spiritually essential values. Moscow, 2004. – 320 p.